

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

DAWN PRESTMO and JEFF PRESTMO,  
husband and wife and the marital  
community thereof,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY  
COMPANY, a foreign corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00610-TL

ORDER ON STIPULATED MOTION  
FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Parties' Stipulated Motion for Protective Order. Dkt. No. 17. Having reviewed the motion and the relevant record, the Court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART the motion with leave to refile.

The motion is DENIED as to the following clause: "Confidential material is not considered part of the public domain at trial or otherwise when the Parties adhere to sections 4.2 and 4.3 of this Order." Dkt. No. 17 at 2 (22–24). The Court will not sanction a blanket agreement to withhold materials from the public at trial, particularly in light of the public's "general right to

1 inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.”  
2 *Kamakana v. City of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner*  
3 *Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)); *see also Courthouse News Serv. v. Planet*, 750  
4 F.3d 776, 785 (9th Cir. 2014) (“The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that access to public  
5 proceedings and records is an indispensable predicate to free expression about the workings of  
6 government.”). Either Party may move to seal materials at trial if they deem it appropriate, and  
7 the Court will consider the merits of each motion at that time. *See Miller v. York Risk Servs.*  
8 *Grp.*, No. C13-1419, 2014 WL 936307, at \*2 (D. Ariz. Mar. 11, 2014) (“[A] proper protective  
9 order cannot automatically apply through trial and beyond. Rather, only to the extent that [the  
10 moving party] can carry its burden to show compelling reasons why some specific material  
11 should be sealed will the court afford protection from disclosure during trial and beyond.”).

12 Accordingly, the Parties may submit for the Court’s consideration a new protective order  
13 that does not include the above clause.

14 Dated this 22nd day of July 2024.

15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 Tana Lin  
18 United States District Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24